

ORIGINAL



0000118178

FROM: Christina Damitio in Peace Almighty Freedom granted by Almighty God.
Christina Damitio hereby invokes Greater Power;
Almighty Freedom granted by Almighty God.

To The Arizona Corporation Commission Commissioners
To Administration Judge Marc Stern Hearing Docket No. S-20714A-09-0553

Comes now Settlement Announcement: TRUTH

No Criminal Action by Christina Damitio;
any Statement to the Contrary is: a false presentation of information and is without Merit;
Obiter Dictum; DOA (Dead on Arrival);
Null and Void at inception.

No evidence of sales or valid documents against Christina Damitio has ever been presented. No statements against Christina Damitio of ever selling ANYTHING exist. No accuser was ever presented to Christina Damitio. Ronald Baran, by invented evidence, has misstated and misapplied evidence to accuse Mrs. Damitio of wrong doing. Only by the influence of Joe Waller and Daniel Thomas or Tanaka, or whatever name he is going by now, was Christina Damitio ever implicated and falsely accused.

There are no sales documentation or contracts in evidence signed by Christina Damitio. Christina Damitio has suffered great mental anguish, emotional distrust, and physical harm due to these unsupported allegations. You have brought false accusations by being influenced or intimidated by rogue agents from other State and Federal Agencies. At a time when our State of Arizona is fighting for justice and upholding the Rights of our Citizens, you choose to accuse innocent people of the Great State of Arizona of wrong doing.

One cannot help but believe someone was unlawfully coached into sending a letter to Christina Damitio. A lot of people work with their boss or supervisor on projects in many different ways, even it is just to know that there is a project going on. Working with someone can mean filing or running errands.

Almighty Freedom granted by Almighty God is affirmed by Arizona Constitution Preamble and Article 1, Section 1; all men by nature are Free.
Your whole case is self-impeached by your own people.
Confirmed by Arizona Constitution, this matter is Settled and Closed;

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

SEP 17 2010

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

Witnessed in Witness Protection in Peace invoking Almighty Freedom granted by Almighty God.

September 16, 2010

Christina Damitio

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2010 SEP 17 A 9:50

RECEIVED

The Crime of Entrapment forwarded again by Christina Damitio on September 17, 2010 as part of brief and statements to the Arizona Corporation Commission, Docket No. S-20714A-09-0553.

The Crime of Entrapment

Vanity Fair December 2009 Issue No. 592, Ppages 248-249

The first Entrapment Defense upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court was in 1932

Randall Sorrels was convicted of selling whiskey in his home in Clyde, North Carolina.

Even though rebuffed by Randall several times, the "agent" posing as a friend's army friend; enticed, induced, pleaded, and persisted in persuading Randall even though Randall was **NOT INCLINED** to do so.

Writing for the other justices, Chief Justice Charles Evans, called the methods used in his case as a **"prostitution of the criminal law."**

He noted that the crime for which Sorrels was prosecuted by the government was the **"product of the creativity of its own officials."**

Since that ruling, the issue of entrapment has come before the Supreme Court several times, and the arguments have traditionally become known as the "subjective" and the "objective tests.

The subjective test for entrapment considered primarily the defendant's state of mind: Was the subject inclined to commit the crime anyway?

The objective test centered more on the action of the investigators: were their methods sufficient to induce an otherwise law abiding citizen to commit a crime?

The most recent ruling on entrapment, in 1992, went a way to knocking down the subjective test.

In 1982 a man ordered a magazine that did not exist! The *Boys Who Love Boys* magazine was the invention of the postal service. When Keith Jacobson went to the post office to pick up the magazine, he was arrested.

His conviction was overturned by the Supreme Court. In the majority opinion, Justice Byron White wrote, **"In their zeal to enforce the law . . . Government agents may not originate a criminal design, implant an innocent person's mind the disposition to commit a criminal act, and then induce commission of the crime so that the Government may prosecute."**

The justices did not address either the subject or objective tests directly, but they made it clear that predisposition alone did not mean guilt, **particularly if the crime was suggested by police to begin with.**